

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the final Office Action of August 3, 2000. A Petition to Extend time to within the first extended month accompanies this response. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

5 Entry of this response is warranted since the claims have not been revised but instead claims have been canceled in an attempt to expedite prosecution of this application. The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 17 to 23 are allowable. With this response, claims 24 to 28 have been canceled without prejudice to the filing of a continuing application to pursue those claims. As explained below,
10 claim 16 is not anticipated or even suggested by Goldman. Claims 16 to 23 are therefore in condition for allowance. This response places the application in condition for allowance and thus should be entered.

 The Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing the printing of game pieces on a web. This aspect of the invention is represented in the drawings. For
15 example, in the Brief Description of the Drawings, Figure 7 is described as showing “part of a web of printed game pieces . . . in which certain indicia may be varied as desired and repetition and predictability of indicia are avoided.” As explained further on pages 24 and 25, the game pieces include both categorical information which lends itself to repetitive printing processes and conditional information which lends itself to
20 variable printing processes. Figure 7 shows game these pieces, which form elements

of the grid on the web, as having both the conditional and categorical information.

Since the drawings do illustrate the printing of game pieces on a web, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 16 and 24 to 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as
5 being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,398,708 to Goldman et al. The Examiner believed that Goldman discloses a method of printing which involves printing categorical information using a repetitive printing process and conditional information using a variable printing process. The Examiner argued that indicia 26 is categorical and indicia 24 is conditional.

10 Goldman, however, does not anticipate the claimed invention. The indicia 24 and 26, argued by the Examiner to be the claimed categorical and conditional information, form the serial number 22 of a lottery ticket. As shown in Figure 3 and explained in column 7, lines 41 to 61, the serial number is printed on the tickets with printer 38. In contrast to Goldman, the claimed invention involves printing
15 categorical information with a repetitive printing process and conditional information with a variable printing process. Thus, the conditional and categorical information are printed using two different processes. With Goldman, on the other hand, indicia 24 and 26 are printed using the same printer and process. Goldman therefore does not anticipate the claimed invention.

Claim 16 is also allowable since Goldman does not disclose the claimed method of repetitive printing and variable printing on a web of game pieces. Claim 16 is directed to a method of printing a grid of promotional game pieces on a web which involves printing a first type of indicia on the web using a repetitive printing process.

- 5 The claimed method also involves printing a second type of indicia on the web using a variable printing process. Thus, with the claimed invention, both the repetitive and the variable printing processes are performed on the same web of promotional game pieces.

In contrast, with Goldman, a photo-lithographic process is performed on a web
10 but computer controlled printing occurs on individual sheets. For example, in column 15, lines 47 to 65, Goldman describes the photo-lithographic process in which the specific card, game theme, and card layout are printed onto a continuous forms web offset with multiple colored stations. Goldman then explains from column 15, line 67 to column 16, line 17, that at the output of the web press, the continuous sheet of
15 printed stock is perforated into fan-folded sheets 50 of cards 10. The sheets 50 are boxed and then sent to the computer controlled printing process. Goldman therefore does not perform both repetitive and variable printing on the same web of game pieces and thus neither discloses nor suggests the claimed invention.

In rejecting claim 16, the Examiner cited column 16, lines 47 to 53, and argued
20 that Goldman describes the claimed repetitive printing process. This section of

Goldman describes a foil stamping process in which foil is applied to individual sheets. This stamping process does not involve the repetitive printing of indicia and furthermore receives sheets of game cards, not a web. The Examiner argued that the lot number is placed on the game cards through a repetitive printing process. The

5 printing of the game data with computer printer 59 and also the printing of the serial number, which specifies a series, lot, and sequence, for a game card, with computer printer 65 are both performed on sheets of game cards, not a web, and also place variable data on the cards. The series, lot, and sequence number forming the serial number varies between cards whereby this printing cannot be considered repetitive.

10 This section of Goldman therefore does not describe the claimed repetitive printing process.

An advantage of the invention is that the repetitive and variable printing may occur during the same printing method on the same web of game pieces. Unlike Goldman, with the invention, the web having a grid of game pieces which are partially

15 printed with such things as the game name, theme, etc. need not be perforated and cut into sheets for printing with a computer-controlled printer. Instead, as specified in claim 16, the variable printing is "in registry with the repetitive printing to form combinations of first indicia and second indicia." Furthermore, the variable printing allows for "selectively placing the second indicia on the grid with the first indicia."

20 The second indicia may comprise such things as bar codes, Pin numbers, prize copy,


Serial No. 09/339,698
Docket No. D1005/192221

game numbers, serial numbers, etc. Goldman does not anticipate and fails to suggest the subject matter of claim 16 whereby claim 16 is allowable.

For at least the above reasons, claims 16 to 23 are allowable. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that can place this application in even better form, 5 the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining matters.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Order Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,



Geoff L. Sutcliffe
Reg. No. 36,348

OF COUNSEL:
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia, 30309-4530
404-815-6530
Attorney Docket No.: D1005/192221